DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 093 JC 830 219

AUTHOR Thomas, Wanda E.; Barker, Stephen C.
TITLE Developing a Workload Formula for High Technology Faculty.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (63rd, April 24-27, 1983, New Orleans, LA).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty Workload; Mathematical Models; *Noninstructional Responsibility; *Teacher Responsibility; *Teaching Load; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A set of criteria for determining faculty workloads in light of changing roles and responsibilities is presented along with a formula that institutions can use to assess faculty workloads. After introductory material, the first section defines a workload formula as a method of determining the responsibilities a faculty member must carry out in a given term and the time needed to fulfill them. The paper then specifies the goals of a workload formula, i.e., to attain efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of instructional programs, to determine overloads and part-time faculty salaries, and to aid in evaluating the costs of new programs, developing annual budgets, and long-range planning. Next, basic assumptions upon which a workload formula should be based are outlined, including administrative support, periodic review, and the application of a common unit of measurement. Then, issues involved in the development of a formula are addressed, such as, who should develop the formula and what responsibilities should be included. The following sections suggest steps in developing a load formula (e.g., obtain an administrative mandate, convene a group responsible for the process, and assign weights for different activities) and list factors that should be included in the formula. The bulk of the report consists of an example of the use of the proposed formula at a hypothetical college, which specifies the weights assigned to particular instructional and non-instructional activities. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229093

1983

AACJC CONVENTION

DEVELOPING A WORKLOAD FORMULA FOR HIGH TECHNOLOGY FACULTY

WANDA E. THOMAS
BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
3501 S.W. DAVIE ROAD
FT. LAUDERDALE, FL 33314
305-475-6767

STEPHEN C. BARKER
BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
1000 COCONUT CREEK BOULEVARD
POMPANO BEACH, FL 33066
305-973-2230

JC 830 219

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wanda Thomas
Stephen Barker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✗ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, in education, a faculty member's workload has been determined by using the semester/quarter credit hour approach with occasional consideration for courses with unusually high contact hour requirements. This approach has been based upon the assumption that the primary responsibility of a faculty member is classroom teaching and that all faculty responsibilities are basically the same. The credit hour approach has worked well when most instruction occurred in three credit hour liberal arts courses delivered primarily by the lecture method. The problem, however, is that many changes have occurred in the instructional programs of the typical institution resulting in changing faculty roles and responsibilities.

Responsibilities have broadened to embrace the new demands of comprehensive curricula that are increasingly technology-based, new methods of instructional delivery, and additional non-instructional faculty responsibilities such as work with advisory boards and accrediting agencies. Consequently, the traditional credit hour method of determining faculty workload has faced increased difficulty in meeting the needs of changing curricula while producing equity in faculty member loads.

In order to respond to these changes and to achieve equity, a new method for determining faculty workload needs to be utilized. This method should determine faculty load on the basis of changing and broadening faculty responsibilities that reflect the needs of new instructional programs.

The objectives of this forum are to:

1. describe the major problems in our present method of assigning workload for high technology faculty.
2. present example of responsibilities that could be included in high technology faculty workloads.
3. show how these responsibilities can be combined and differentially weighted into a workload formula.
4. suggest a process that institutions can use to develop and implement such a formula.
5. present examples of the application of a workload formula.

WORKLOAD FORMULA: A DEFINITION

A method for determining a faculty member's load that accounts for broadened responsibilities while achieving equity involves the application of a workload formula. Application of a workload formula involves determining what responsibilities a faculty member must carry out in a given term and how much time will be needed to carry out these responsibilities. Once the faculty member's activities are quantified in terms of time, the formula will determine the number of hours that must be worked to carry out the activities. If the total number of hours for a given instructional period is too high or low then adjustments can be made in order to achieve equitable workloads.

GOALS OF A WORKLOAD FORMULA

Any new method for determining workload should be able to achieve the ultimate goal of efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of instructional programs. Efficient implies that application of a workload formula should result in maintaining or decreasing instructional costs. As will be seen later, application of a workload formula can serve to redistribute faculty responsibilities so that some faculty will experience increased responsibilities, others will decrease with a net outcome of unchanged costs. Effectiveness suggests that the formula can account for those responsibilities that will promote improved learning outcomes. These responsibilities include such things as instructional development activities and professional development. When instructional development and professional development activities are included in the formula as part of faculty responsibilities, faculty tend to place greater emphasis on these activities. This could result in active experimentation and innovation with instructional delivery strategies and active staff development. Similar results may be achieved

with program development and modification if the formula recognizes this activity as part of the workload.

Application of a workload formula can help achieve non-instructional effectiveness by recognizing the importance of non-teaching responsibilities. Responsibilities such as committee work, work with advisory boards, and preparing grant proposals can increase the effectiveness of the institution. Recognition of these activities as a legitimate part of a faculty member's responsibilities can provide an incentive for greater faculty involvement.

If a workload formula is to be effective, it should accommodate almost all faculty situations. Realizing the increasing diversity of faculty responsibilities, the formula should recognize these differences among faculty while producing equitable workloads. The sociology faculty member teaching five three-credit intro sociology courses should be working roughly the same number of hours as the nursing instructor who teaches labs, works on accreditation, and is engaging in instructional development. It should be realized, however, that some unique situations may require unique adjustments in the application of the formula.

Depending upon the needs of the institution, the formula can be used to achieve a variety of other goals. It can be used for the purpose of determining overloads and part-time faculty salaries. As opposed to utilizing a flat rate for all types of part-time instruction, the formula provides a more equitable way of reimbursing faculty. Similarly, the formula can be extended to apply to summer and inter-sessions.

For purposes of evaluating the costs of new programs, developing annual budgets, and long range planning, the formula can be useful. Numbers of courses to be taught and associated faculty activities can be entered into the formula to reveal the number of full-time equated faculty that

are needed for an instructional term. It can also be used as the basis for faculty evaluation. Application of the formula requires a clear definition of faculty members' responsibilities. These responsibilities can then be clearly understood by the administration and the faculty as the basis for evaluation.

If the formula is to be maximally useful, it should be comprehensible and not unnecessarily complex because the method is quantitative. The format and the mathematics involved can become cumbersome; therefore, care should be taken in construction of the formula.

Another goal for the development of the formula can be the mutual involvement of the administration and the faculty. Faculty involvement may enhance the ultimate acceptance of the plan and the ease with which it can be implemented and supported.

Finally, the use of an alternative method for determining workload can improve faculty morale, particularly for faculty in the non-liberal arts and high technology disciplines. By including in the formula all of the activities that a faculty member must engage in more positive faculty attitudes regarding their role in the institution could occur.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

If a workload formula is to be successfully used there are several basic assumptions that must be understood. The most important is that the present method for determining load is not adequate. However, if your institution is traditional, largely liberal arts, with little emphasis on the technologies, the credit hour approach may be adequate.

Most institutions will want to assume that costs will not increase when using the formula. However, some institutions may wish to consider paying for faculty involvement in expanded responsibilities.

Another assumption could be that the faculty responsibilities included in the formula should be based on the institution's goals and objectives. If, for example, the college has as a goal community service, the college may want to include this factor as part of the formula.

If the formula is to be developed and effectively implemented, it must have the support and direction of the administration. Needless to say, lack of such support dooms the plan to failure.

If your institution engages in collective bargaining, application of the formula must not interfere with the terms of the contract.

A critical assumption is that the basic unit of measurement to be used is time. All activities are to be of equal value with one hour of any one activity being equivalent to an hour of any other activity. It also must be assumed that all load factors can be quantified in terms of time.

If a formula is to be best utilized, it must be periodically reviewed. Changes in the institution's curricula and faculty responsibilities must be accompanied by changes in the factors used in the formula.

A faculty member's load must be determined prior to each academic session and generally cannot be changed during the session. Adjustments in teaching load which constitute the majority of the faculty member's responsibilities cannot be made after the beginning of the session.

Finally, it must be assumed that most faculty work an average of forty hours per week. This will vary from institution to institution. No formula will be able to assume that all faculty will work the same number of hours per week; therefore, a range must be established.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

If an institution intends to develop a workload formula, several issues need to be resolved.

First who should be involved in the development of the formula? The governance structure of some institutions may call for the heavy involvement of faculty whereas others may choose to invoive only administrators. Impact on morale should be considered.

Should the formula be used for part-time courses and summers? Cost implications and time involved in administering the formula will need to be considered.

What faculty responsibilities (factors) will be included in the formula and what process will be used to identify them? All factors should be based upon the job description and it should be recognized that in developing the formula the job description may need to be modified. The process used to identify these factors should be thought out in terms of the degree and nature of faculty involvement.

What will be the impact on collective bargaining? Will there be new responsibilities outside the current contractual agreement. Do these new responsibilities fall in the domain of management rights or past practice clauses? Does the contract state predetermined number of hours faculty must work in a week?

Should department heads and coordinators (i.e. persons with both faculty and administrative responsibilities) use the formula? The formula can be effectively used to determine instructional load for those administrators with teaching as part of their duties.

Once the formula is applied and a faculty member is not within the established range, what should be done? Consideration can be given to 1) removing responsibilities according to a predetermined priority order 2) adding

responsibilities 3) paying an overload or 4) banking excess points or deficit points until the next term.

How many hours should a faculty member be reasonably expected to work in a week? Depending upon the institution and its history, ranges may extend from 30-50 hours. Each institution must decide what is a reasonable number of hours for a work week and establish a range around that number.

Once the number of hours and the range has been determined, where can these hours be worked (college, home, clinical site, etc.)?

Finally, should additional points be assigned to certain factors such as night, Saturday or off campus classes?

STEPS TO FOLLOW IN DEVELOPING A LOAD FORMULA

Once the institution has decided to develop a workload formula, an initial administrative mandate must be obtained. This mandate should be communicated as a specific charge by the President and possibly his/her staff. In some circumstances it may be necessary to seek legal counsel prior to initiating the change to insure that there are no conflicts with the collective bargaining agreement.

If in developing a formula changes in the job description are needed, costs are increased or institutional goals and objectives are changed, the governing board may need to be involved. Some institutions may choose to involve a board member in the process.

Consideration should then be given to the factors that may be included in the formula. Administrative direction may be necessary to outline factors that would be considered appropriate. Care should be taken that these factors are included in the job description and relate to the institution's overall goals and objectives. The goals that the formula will achieve should then be determined. These goals may range from modest hopes of equity in workloads to

major revamping of faculty responsibilities.

Basic assumptions must be reviewed. These assumptions will serve as the parameters that will guide the development of the formula.

Next, the process for developing the formula needs to be determined. Issues such as the involvement of faculty, use of a task force or the president's cabinet, and timetable for implementation will need to be resolved. The process along with the goals and basic assumptions for the workload formula should be distributed by the president.

Once the responsible group is convened, factors to be included in the formula will need to be determined. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways including distributing a questionnaire to faculty, conducting a functional task analysis or reviewing factors incorporated in formulas at other institutions.

When these factors have been identified the number of points (i.e. number of hours required to accomplish each activity) to be assigned to each factor must be determined. For example, how much preparation time should be allowed for a course, or how much time should be allowed in grading English themes?

After the units for each factor have been determined a preliminary formula can be constructed. This formula should then be tested by selecting a sample of faculty to determine the number of hours faculty are actually working. Care should be exercised in selecting a representative sample that includes extremes in faculty load. Once the actual number of hours worked by the sample are known it will be necessary to establish a range of hours that will be acceptable as a work week. If the range is considerably over or under 40 hours per week it may be necessary to review the factors included in the formula and the number of units assigned to each.

Next, a decision should be made as to how to handle averages or deficits in load. A sample of faculty should be selected for final pilot test of the formula.

Procedures should then be developed that outline how the formula is to be administered. Faculty and administrators should then be trained. A plan should then be developed requiring periodic re-evaluation of the formula to insure it best serves the needs of the institution's educational programs.

List of Possible Factors:

The factors to be incorporated in the workload formula are dependent on responsibilities outlined in the job description, institutional goals, the collective bargaining agreement, and the institutions receptiveness to change.

The following is a list of possible factors which may be included:

a. number of different preparations
b. number of teaching contact hours
c. number of office hours
d. number of students
e. laboratory preparations/management
f. day/night/Saturday/off campus classes
g. committee assignments
h. sponsorship of clubs
i. duplicate course preparations
j. serving on state, regional, national organizations
k. method and figuring of evaluation
l. curriculum/instructional development
m. paraprofessional assistance
n. professional development
o. advising students
p. departmental/college meetings
q. experiential learning
r. cooperative education
s. special assignments
t. extra teaching assignment

EXAMPLE OF A FORMULA

Using a process similar to that outlined previously, factors were selected and basic assumptions for each factor were developed. These assumptions determined the weights (points) to be given to each factor. Points were then equated to hours, each point being equivalent to one hour. Once points were assigned, the average range of points for full-time employment was derived. The average range of points equated to the average hours per week the faculty member is required to work.

The formula was tested by collecting data on faculty activities. The data was then used to calculate the total number of points faculty member earned in one term. Faculty data from several different areas of the college, especially teaching areas such as high tech, allied health, and other technical programs, was used.

The following is a hypothetical formula for a college and associated assumptions used to develop the formula:

LOAD FACTORS/ASSIGNMENT OF WEIGHTS

1. Number of Preparations:

Assumptions:

1. As the number of semester credit hours increases, the time required for preparation (and the subsequent awarding of points) increases.
2. Duplicate sections do not receive additional preparation points.
3. Each different preparation should be awarded points based on the number of credit hours it is assigned.
4. On the assumption that each faculty member spends at least one hour in preparation per week for each hour of class, each credit hour of preparation equals 15 points.
5. Preparation points for laboratory responsibilities are awarded through points given for the extra number of credit hours of most laboratory courses.
6. Preparation points for courses not previously taught are given under course development.

1. NUMBER OF PREPARATIONS: continued.

POINT DISTRIBUTION:

For each separate preparation, each credit hour is awarded 15 points; therefore,

A one credit hour prep = 15 points

A two credit hour prep = 30 points

A three credit hour prep = 45 points

A four credit hour prep = 60 points

A five credit hour prep = 75 points

Calculating Points:

Multiply the number of credit hours for each different preparation times 15, and then add together the points from each preparation.

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A has one preparation. He/she is teaching five sections of the same 3 credit course.

Points: One three credit prep = 45 points.

EXAMPLE B:

Faculty member B has 3 preparations. All three preps are 3 credit courses.

Points: One three credit prep = 45 points

Three three credit preps = 3 X 45 = 135 points

or 45 + 45 + 45 = 135 points.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL CONTACT HOURS: (HOURS IN SCHEDULED INSTRUCTIONAL CONTACT WITH GROUPS OF STUDENTS)

ASSUMPTIONS:

For each hour a faculty member is scheduled for instructional contact with students (hours in class, etc.) he/she will receive one point.

Calculation of Points

Number of contact hours/week x number of weeks/term = #points/term

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A is in class for 15 hours per week.

Calculation of Points

15 contact hours/week x 15 weeks = 225 points/term

INSTRUCTIONAL CONTACT HOURS: LABORATORIES

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. One hour equals one point
2. It is the intent of the college that the actual preparation of laboratories for student use will be done by other than full-time faculty.
3. Where faculty actually are solely responsible for the conduct of a laboratory they will receive one point per scheduled hour spent in the laboratory.
4. Points for preparation of instruction or evaluation are awarded under preparation (credit hours assigned to the laboratory portion of the course) or evaluation (determined by the amount frequency and type of evaluation.)

EXAMPLE A

Faculty member A has a three hour lab but has been assigned a paraprofessional who preps the labs, teaches the labs, evaluates the students, and records the grades.

Calculation of points

Number of hours x number of weeks = points

0 x 15 = 0 points

EXAMPLE B

Faculty member B has only limited access to a paraprofessional. He teaches his labs himself, and evaluates the students. It is a three hour laboratory. Points are earned in two categories: contact and evaluation. However, only contact points are considered here.

Calculation of points

Number of hours per week x number of weeks

3 x 15 = 45 points

3. EVALUATION: (TIME SPENT IN EVALUATING AND RECORDING STUDENT WORK)

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Points for time spent in developing tests are awarded under preparation or course development.
2. The number of students, type of tests, and frequency of testing determines the amount of time required for evaluation.
3. Although different types of testing requires differing amounts of evaluation time, this formula does not recognize more than the three basic types of testing: essay, objective, and combination essay-objective.
4. Grading of essay tests or themes requires the greatest amount of grading time, followed by combination essay-objective tests, and then objective tests.
5. It was assumed that the average faculty member could grade 7 essay exams per hour (8/minute).
6. It was assumed that the average faculty member could grade 11 combination objective-essay test per hour.
7. It was assumed that the average faculty member could grade 20 objective tests per hour.
8. A faculty member could record at least 100 grades per hour and the recording of grades was assumed to take the same amount of time regardless of the type of testing.
9. If an assistant was used to grade or record the tests, the faculty member's points would be reduced.

TYPE OF EVALUATION CONTINUED:

Point Distribution:

ESSAY

1. Faculty grades-faculty records = 0.14 pts/student/test
2. Faculty grades-assistant records = 0.13 pts/student/test
3. Assistant grades-faculty records = 0.01 pts/student/test
4. Assistant grades-assistant records = 0.00 pts/student/test

COMBINATION

1. Faculty grades-faculty records = 0.10 pts/student/test
2. Faculty grades-assistant records = 0.09 pts/student/test
3. Assistant grades-faculty records = 0.01 pts/student/test
4. Assistant grades-assistant records = 0.00 pts/student/test

OBJECTIVE

1. Faculty grades-faculty records = 0.06 pts/student/test
2. Faculty grades-assistant records = 0.05 pts/student/test
3. Assistant grades-faculty records = 0.01 pts/student/test
4. Assistant grades-assistant records = 0.00 pts/student/test
5. Machine scored-faculty records = 0.01 pts/student/test
6. Machine scored -assistant records = 0.00 pts/student/test

TYPE OF EVALUATION: continued.

CALCULATION OF EVALUATION POINTS:

Information needed:

1. The faculty member must know:
   a. type of evaluation conducted for each course
   b. frequency of testing in each course
2. The coordinator/chairperson must supply the number of students in each section. This means that adjustments will be negotiated at the time the final load is determined.

To Calculate the Number of Points:

1. Determine which factor best approximates the type of evaluation for each course taught by the faculty member.
2. Multiply the points given to the selected method of evaluation times the number of times tests are given times the anticipated number of students for each section.
3. Add the totals from each of the courses.

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A is teaching five courses.

Course one: Gives 3 essay exams - graded by himself/herself and recorded by the assistant. The class has 25 students.

Points	X	Students	X	frequency/tests	=	Total
0.13	X	25	X	3	=	9.75

Course Two: Gives four exams, usually a combination of essay and objective questions. The tests are graded and recorded by the assistant. There are 100 students in the course.

Points	X	Students	X	Frequency of Tests	= Total
0.00	X	100	X	4	= 0.00

Courses three-five: Gives 5 exams which are multiple-choice. They are recorded by the faculty member and graded by the faculty member. There are 30 students per class or a total of 90 students in all three sections.

Points	X	Students	X	Frequency of Tests	= Total
0.06	X	90	X	5	= 27 pts.

Total Points:

Add the totals from all the courses/sections.

Section one	+	Section Two	+	Section three-five	= Total
9.75	+	0.00	+	27	= 36.75 pts.

4. INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The Supervision of paraprofessionals is the responsibility of those faculty who are the assigned instructor for the course.
2. Self paced, independent study centers once fully operational will be operated by paraprofessionals under the supervision of faculty members.
3. Instructional supervision of paraprofessionals earns points at the rate of one hour equals one point.
4. Credit for student credit hours generated by self-paced laboratories is awarded to the faculty member(s) who are responsible for the course. These points are entered under student adjustment hours.

Calculating Points

Hours of Management/week x Number of weeks = Number of Points

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A has a weekly three hour laboratory which is taught by a paraprofessional under his/her supervision. Supervision/coordination of this laboratory requires approximately one hour per week.

Calculation of Points:

Hours/week	x	number of weeks	= Total Points
1	x	15	= 15 points

5. OFFICE HOURS: (SCHEDULED HOURS WHEN FACULTY MEMBER IS AVAILABLE FOR STUDENT CONFERENCES, THIS IS SEPARATE FROM ASSIGNED ADVISEES)

ASSUMPTIONS

1. All faculty members are scheduled for five office hours per week.
2. One point is given for each weekly scheduled office hour and one hour equals one point.
3. If a faculty member has more students than the average range of 100 to 125 students, additional office hours may be assigned at the rate of one additional hour per week for each twenty-five students

Calculating Points:

Number of office hours/week X number of weeks/term = #points/term

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A has five hours of office hours per week.

Calculation of Points

Number of office hours/week	x	number of weeks/term	=	Points/term
5	x	15	=	75

EXAMPLE B:

Faculty member B has 250 students; therefore, he/she has 125 additional students or is eligible for 5 additional office hours.

Number of office hours/week	X	number of weeks	=	Points
10	X	15	=	150 points

6. NUMBER OF ADVISEES:

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. A faculty member will usually spend half an hour per semester with each advisee or one hour a year.
2. One hour of advising is equivalent to 1 point, or ½ hour equals 0.5 point.

Calculation of Points Per Semester:

Multiply the number of students times 0.5 point per semester.

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A has 11 advisees per semester.

Points: 11 X 0.5 = 5.5 points per semester.

EXAMPLE B:

Faculty member B has 30 advisees per semester.

Points: 30 X 0.5 = 15 points per semester.

7. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: (DEVELOPING NEW COURSES, REVISING EXISTING COURSES, DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVE TEACHING STRATEGIES, AND TEACHING A NEW PREPARATION)

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Curriculum development points will be based on a review of a proposal which meets specific guidelines.
2. Points will be awarded based on the number of hours worked.
3. Faculty members with a full load who are working on the development of a new course (never taught before) or program may receive up to 135 points in that term (9 hours per week). It was felt no one would have more time to spend on such a project while carrying a "full-time" load.
4. Faculty members with a full load attempting a major revision of an existing course or teaching the course in any one term may receive up to 90 points (6 hours per week). It was felt that a faculty member revising a course would already have some materials to draw from.
5. Faculty members with a full load proposing minor revisions of an existing course may receive up to 45 points during that term. Since a certain amount of revision should be a part of the normal activity of any instructor, the award of these points should be revisions which are not routine.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: continued.

6. The faculty member with a full load who proposes to develop individualized learning materials for a specific course may receive up to 135 points that term, (9 hours per week). The same rationale applies as in number 3 - no faculty member carrying a full-time load can devote more time per week to such an activity.
7. A faculty member proposing to develop alternative learning materials for grouped-based instruction may receive up to 90 points that term, (6 hours per week). A faculty member making such a proposal would already have some substantial materials to draw from.
8. Final approval regarding the awarding of points will be made by the vice president of instruction to provide consistency in the awardment of points.
9. Faculty members may re-apply for additional curriculum development points in subsequent terms.
10. Faculty members not carrying a full-load may receive points for curriculum development. Points will be awarded by vice president of instruction based on the review of the proposal.

8. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS

Additional assignments which are agreed upon by the faculty member(s) and his/her supervisor will be assigned points on the basis of the number of hours which the assignment will involve. All special assignment points will be approved by the vice president.

Points

1 point = 1 hour

9. ASSESSMENT OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. One hour of assessment = one point
2. One hour of assessment is required for each credit sought.
3. If assessment of experiential learning is requested after load has been allocated, that portion of points earned which represents overload will be paid at an overload rate or may be carried over to the next term.

10. INVOLVEMENT WITH COOPERATIVE EDUCATION

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. One hour = one point
2. It was assumed that the faculty member will spend one hour per credit with each student developing the objectives to be accomplished during the term.
3. The task of locating jobs will be done by a cooperative education director.
4. The number of students who are eligible for cooperative education and who will be registering will be known well in advance of the time that faculty workloads are developed.
5. The faculty member will make 1-2 contacts with the job supervisor of each student and is responsible for the final evaluation of the student.
6. Faculty members will be reimbursed on an overload basis unless the number of students equals 25 or more. Under this circumstance it can be considered as part of their full-time load. (As per your request but would be difficult to explain a rationale for this.)

Calculating Points:

One point per credit for each co-op student developing objectives.

One point for each hour spent contacting employer for each student.

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION: Continued

EXAMPLE A:

Faculty member A has 4 students who will register for cooperative education.

Calculation of Points:

Development of objectives: one hour for each credit.

Number of Credits	X	Number of Students	=	points
3	X	4	=	12 points

Contacts with employer: one point for each hour.

Two contacts per term for each student.

Number of Contacts	X	Number of Hours	X	Number of Students	
2	X	1	X	4	= 18 pts.

Evaluation:

Taken into account under the heading of evaluation.

Evaluation may have already been completed by the employer.

Total points: 20 pts.

11. ADJUSTMENT FOR STUDENT NUMBERS

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. It was felt that faculty members who were producing high student semester hours should be awarded extra points.
2. No points would be awarded for faculty who are producing less than 375 student semester hours.
3. No minimum student semester hours were established, because this was felt to be punitive for those teaching courses with little opportunity of attracting a large number of students. Example, certain sophomore courses, nursing practicum, etc.
4. Since the average class has 25 students, each additional student is equal to 1/25 or a factor of 0.04.
5. Points will be approximated initially with final adjustment occuring as of the _____ day of class.

Calculating Points:

Number of additional student semester hours* X credit hours X .04 factor = adjusted student numbers.

*student semester hours = number of students/class X credit hours/course.

Add the number from all sections together.

CALCULATIONS TO DETERMINE AVERAGE RANGE

ASSUMPTIONS:

The average faculty member:

1. has 2-3 different course preparations per term and spends at least one hour preparing for each credit per week,
2. has five hours of office hours per week,
3. has twenty to thirty advisees,
4. has fifteen-nineteen contact hours per semester,
5. evaluates at least four times a semester
6. averages 125 students per semester or 375 student semester hours (125 X 3 = 375).

POINT RANGE

Minimum		Maximum	
Preps 2 (3 credits each)	= 90	Preps 3 (3 cr. each)	= 135
Office hours (5 X 1 X 15)	= 75	Office hours	= 75
Advisees-20 (20 X 0.5)	= 10	Advisees-20	= 10
Contact hours (15 X 15)	=225	Contact hours (19 X15)	=285
Evaluation (objective) (0.6 X 4 X 125)	= 30	Evaluation (Comb.) (0.10 X 4 X 125)	= 50
Student Adjustment (125 X 3 = 375)	= 0	Student Adjustment (125 X 3 = 375)	= 0
Points	=430	Points	= 560

SAMPLE WORKLOADS

Preps - one 3 credit course	= 45 points
Advisees - 20 (20 X 0.5)	= 10 points
Evaluation (C) (0.10 X 4 X 154)	= 61.5 points
Office hours (5 X 1 X 15)	= 75 points
Contact hours (12 X 15)	= 180 points
Student Adjustment (462 - 375 = 87 X 12 X.04)	= 41.76 points
	413.26 points

Since average is a minum of 430, Lyman lacks 87 points, but was given 3 credits of time or the equivalent of 105 additional points (3 credits = 3 X 35). This brings him into the average range.

Preps - two (one 3 credits & one 4 credit)(45 +60)	= 105 points
Advisees 20 (20 X 0.5)	= 10 points
Evaluation (C) (0.10 X 4 X 108)	= 43.2 points
Office hours (5 X 1 X 15)	= 75 points
Contact hours (14 X 15)	= 210 points
Student Adjustment (452-375 X 14 X 0.04)	= 43.13 points
	486.33 points

Average Range 430-560

Padula was given 4 credits of released time also.

Preps - 2 (3 credits each) (45 + 45)	= 90 points
Advisees 20 (20 X 0.5)	= 10 points
Evaluation (C) (0.10 X 4 X 108)	= 43.2 points
Office hours (5 X 1 X 15)	= 75 points
Contact hours (12 X 15)	= 180 points
Student Adjustment (324)	= 0 points
	398.2 points

Average 430-560 points

Needs 32 points for a full-time load

Preps - 2 (3 credits each) (45 + 45)	= 90 points
Advisees 20 (20 X 0.5)	= 10 points
Evaluation (0) (0.6 X 4 X 194)	= 31.04 points
Office hours (5 X 1 X 15)	= 75 points
Contact hours (15 X 15)	= 225 points
Student Adjustment (582-375 X 15 X 0.04)	= 124.2 points
	630.24 points

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
JUN 17 1983